CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 1 5 2005

LAW OFFICES OF

McGINN & GIBB, PLLC

A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 200 **VIENNA, VIRGINIA** 22182-3817 TELEPHONE: (703) 761-4100 FACSIMILE/DATA: (703) 761-2375; 761-2376

E-MAIL: MCGINNGIBB @ AOL.COM

SEAN M. MCGINN PHILLIP E. MILLER+ FREDERICK E. COOPERRIDERT JAMES E. HOWARDT JAMES N. DRESSER JOHN J. DRESCH SCOTT M. TULINO J. BRADLEY WRIGHT+

TMEMBER OF BAR OTHER THAN VA

ANNAPOLIS, MD OFFICE FREDERICK W. GIBB, III LAWRENCE A. SCOTT+ PAMELA M. RILEYT

TP A	CSIMILE	COVED	CHEFT
PА	CSIVILLE	COVER	SHEET

(This cover page + sheets)

TO: FROM: Frederick E. Cooperrider Phone: (703) 761-2377 RE: This facsimile message and attachments (if any) may contain information that is privileged, confidential, attorney-work product, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. This message and any attachment(s) are intended for only the individual or entity named above (or those properly entitled to access the information). If the reader of this transmission is not the intended or an authorized recipient, any unauthorized distribution, dissemination, or copying of this transmission and the attachement(s), if any, is prohibited

If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify McGinn&Gibb, PLLC, at any of

the numbers indicated above, or by email.



United States Patént and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/060,398		02/01/2002	Takao Inoue	PU01-01115	9587	
21254	7590	04/12/2005	RECEIVED	EXAMINER		
	MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD		100 1 3 000°	NGUYEN, CHANH DUY		
SUITE 200	OOKIIN	DUSE ROAD	APR 1 3 2005	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
VIENNA, V	/A 2218	2-3817	FUN 1-019	2675	•	
			McGINN & GIBB, P.C.	DATE MAILED: 04/12/2009	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/060,398	INOUE, TAKAO			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Chanh Nguyen	2675			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress -		
THE REPLY FILED 23 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:					
The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply ongi r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri	iate extension fee		
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	is of the date of e appeal. Since		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	ecause		
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further con (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belon) 		TE below);			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet		ducing or simplifying t	the issues for		
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected cialms.			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).		
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 		timely filed amendme	ent cancolina the		
non-allowable claim(s).			-		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☑ will vided below or appended.	l be entered and an e	xplanation of		
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1.2 and 21-26</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>8-11</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>6.7 and 12-20</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant falled to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidavi	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome all rejections under annea	il and/or appellant fail	e to provide a		
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach). ed.		
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Shoot	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:		
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	o(s)			
13. Other:		Chanh Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2675	ym		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 4-05)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No. 10/060,398

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner indicated claims 1-2, 21-26 are allowed and claim 6 is allowed only if dependent claims 8-9 are incoporated into independent claim 6. Applicant's representative authorized the examiner to make such change in claim 6 by examiner's amendment (see Statement of Substance of Interview faxed by applicant on 03/25/05). However, Applicant's representative does not authorize examiner to charge the time extension fee so that the notice of allowance with examiner's amendment can be sent out. After consulting with examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz, the issue "dependent claims be incoporated into the independent claims" is not formal matter as applicant's argument (see statement of substance of interview faxed by applicant on 03/28/05). Applicant's may petition the extension time matter before examiner's amendment and notice of allowance can be sent out.

LAW OFFICES OF

McGINN & GIBB, PLLC

A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 200
VIENNA, VIRGINIA 22182-3817
TELEPHONE: (703) 761-4100

FACSIMILE/DATA: (703) 761-2375; 761-2376 E-MAIL: MCGINNGIBB @ AOL.COM

SEAN M. MCGINN
PHILLIP E. MILLER†
FREDERICK E. COOPERRIDER†
JAMES E. HOWARD†
JAMES N. DRESSER
JOHN J. DRESCH
SCOTT M. TULINO
J. BRADLEY WRIGHT†
TMEMBER OF BAR OTHER THAN VA

ANNAPOLIS, MD OFFICE FREDERICK W. GIBB, III MOHAMMAD S. RAHMANT PAMELA M. RILEYT

March 28, 2005

VIA FACSIMILE (Total No. of Pages Transmitted: 3)

To: Examiner C. Nguyen

Group Art Unit No. 2675

Facsimile No.: (703) 872-9306/746-5792

From: Frederick E. Cooperrider

Facsimile No.: (703) 761-2375 or 76

Re:

Statement of Substance of Interview

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/060,398 Attorney Docket No. FUЛ.014 (PU01-01115)

Examiner Nguyen:

Enclosed is a Statement of Substance of Interview, which we request be made of record, for the telephone interview conducted on March 24, 2005.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration on this case.

Very truly yours,

Frederick E. Cooperrider Registration No. 36,769

FEC/fec Enclosure

RECEIVED **CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APR 1 5 2005

In re Application of

Takao INOUE

Serial No.: 10/060,398

Group Art Unit: 2675

Filed: February 1, 2002

Examiner: C. Nguyen

LIGHT EMITTING DIODE DRIVING CIRCUIT

Honorable Commissioner of Patents Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Sir:

In response to the requirement that Applicants place a statement of the substance of an interview in the record. Applicant hereby submits the following.

Applicant's representative received a telephone call from the Examiner on March 23, 2005. The Examiner stated that he was ready to allow the Application if claims 8 and 9 were incorporated into claim 6. Following coordination with the Applicant, Applicant's representative on March 24, 2005, authorized the Examiner to make such changes by Examiner's Amendment.

The Examiner called back requesting authorization to charge the Applicant's representative's deposit number for a time extension fee. Applicant's representative stated that he considered the charge for the time extension fee was not appropriate in this instance under the exception described in MPEP §706.07(I): "However, an examiner's amendment correcting only formal matters which are identified for the first time after a reply is made to a final Office action would not require any extension fee, since the reply to the final Office action put the application in condition for allowance except for the correction of formal matters, the correction of which had not yet been required by the examiner."

Serial No. 10/060,398 Docket No. PU01-01115 Interview Summary

2

Applicant submits that, in the present instance, the Examiner's requirement that dependent claims be incorporated into the dependent claim is a mere formal matter that was not previously of record by either the newly-appointed Examiner or the previous Examiner.

However, in order to expedite prosecution, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Attorney Deposit Account No. 50-0481 for the appropriate time extension fee. A request for refund potentially will be filed to address the propriety of the charge in the instant case.

3/28/05 Date

Frederick E. Cooperrider (Reg. No. 36, 769)

McGinn & Gibb, PLLC 8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200 Vienna, VA 22182-3817 (703) 761-4100 Customer No. 21254

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSMISSION

I certify that I transmitted via facsimile to (703) 872-9306 this Statement of Substance of Interview to Examiner C. Nguyen on March 28, 2005.

Frederick Cooperider

Reg. No. 36,769